

REMARKS:

After entry of this response, claims 1 to 3, 5, 7 to 13, 15, 16, and 18 to 23 will be pending. Claims 1 to 3, 5, 7, 8, 11 to 13, 15, and 18 to 23 have been amended, and claims 4, 6, 14, 17, and 24 to 38 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 11, and 15 are the pending independent claims. Entry of this response, reconsideration, and further examination are respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of Previous Arguments

Applicant hereby withdraws all previous arguments made in this case as moot. In view of the final Office Action, these arguments have not persuaded the Examiner and are therefore immaterial to the allowance of any of the currently pending claims.

Election/Restriction

The Office indicated that originally submitted claims 1 to 23 and claims 24 to 38 added in the previous response in this case were directed toward independent or distinct inventions. The Office withdrew claims 24 to 38. Applicant has cancelled the withdrawn claims without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in an application that claims priority from this application.

Section 112 Rejections

Applicant's amendments herein are believed to address the issues raised in the 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, rejections in the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of those rejections is respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,723 (O'Toole) and U.S. Patent No. 5,247,683 (Holmes). Claims 19 to 23 were rejected under § 103(a) over O'Toole. The amended claims are discussed below in view of this art, grouped by independent claim.

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 7 to 10, and 18 to 20: Claim 1 is the independent one of these claims and is reproduced below as amended:

1. A method including
at a device, reading a set of information from a set of resources including at least a source local to said device and an information server remote from said device;
setting values for one or more variables at said device in response to said information; and
if said setting step changes an indication of said set of resources, re-performing the steps of reading and setting until said step of setting does not change said indication of said set of resources;
wherein said setting step resolves conflicts when said information from any two sources assigns two inconsistent values to any of said one or more variables by determining, for said any two sources, a higher priority source and a lower priority source.

The art cited in the Office Action is not believed to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, at least with respect to the feature of, "if said setting step changes an

indication of said set of resources, re-performing the steps of reading and setting until said step of setting does not change said indication of said set of resources.”

This feature is somewhat akin to the feature recited by cancelled claim 4, which recited in part “re-performing said operations of reading said set of information and setting values until said set of resources is unchanged.” One difference is that the new claim language recites that the steps are re-performed if the setting step changes and *indication* of the set of resources. An example in the application of such an indication is the FILE-LIST variable. Claim 1 is not limited to this example.

The Office Action cited O’Toole at col. 22, lines 1 to 7, col. 23, lines 60 to 67, and col. 24, lines 1 to 11, as teaching the re-performing step of claim 4. This text is reproduced below:

SODA Database

In order to function, the SODA network needs to track configuration information and network topology information as well as information about content, policies, and management settings. All of this information is stored in a database. The challenge in designing the database is that it needs to be extensible and distributed.

...

One of the main challenges in a distributed database is maintaining consistency among the records stored at different locations. In one implementation, updates are performed at the roots of SODA nets. These updates are then propagated to the appliances from the root.

A root maintains a log of all recent updates. Each appliance contacts the root once in a while to check whether there are any recent updates. If so, it pulls over these updates and applies them to its local copy of the database. If the appliance is far behind, it replaces the local database with a fresh copy of the root's database. Because different tables

of records might have different roots, an appliance might have to contact multiple machines in order to update its local copy of the database.

The updates at the root are performed through a Web-based interface so that the administrator of the information stored at the root can be physically separated from the root machine itself.

Nothing in this text teaches re-performing certain steps if the updates change an indication of a set of resources from which information is read. This text also does not teach that the updates are re-performed until the updates do not change such an indication. Thus, even if the updates are considered to be equivalent to the recited reading and setting steps, this language of O'Toole still does not teach the conditional re-performing feature of claim 1.

Col. 22, lines 8 to 14, of O'Toole mentions a desirability to be able to change where records should be loaded from, as follows:

The extensibility of the database means that administrators should be able to change the database schema while an appliance is running as well as database items that describe how the SODA network should work. For example, it is desirable to be able to change where records should be loaded from, which machine is the root for a particular SODA net, in which networks an appliance should appear, etc.

Thus, O'Toole teaches that it is desirable to change information such as “where records should be loaded from, which machine is the root for a particular SODA net, in which networks an appliance should appear, etc.” However, the text is silent as to re-performing any steps until a step of setting values does not change such information. Accordingly, these portions of O'Toole are not believed by Applicant to teach amended claim 1's feature of, “if said setting step changes an indication of said set of resources, re-performing the steps of reading and setting until said step of setting does not

change said indication of said set of resources.” Nothing else in O’Toole is seen to teach this feature.

Holmes appears to Applicant to be silent as to such a feature as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested of the § 103(a) rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims. Allowance of those claims also is requested.

Claims 11 to 13, 15, 16, and 21 to 23: Claim 11 is the independent one of these claims and is reproduced below as amended:

11. An apparatus including
at least one information server;
a device remote from said information server, said device
including memory having computer programs and data structures capable
of being performed by said device to perform steps of reading a set of
information from a set of resources including at least a source local to said
device and said information server, setting values for one or more
variables at said device in response to said information, and if said setting
step changes an indication of said set of resources, re-performing said
steps of reading and setting until said step of setting does not change said
indication of said set of resources;
wherein said setting step resolves conflicts when said information
from any two sources assigns two inconsistent values to any of said one or
more variables by determining, for said any two sources, a higher priority
said source and a lower priority said source.

This claim also recited the feature of, “if said setting step changes an indication of said set of resources, re-performing said steps of reading and setting until said step of setting does not change said indication of said set of resources.” As discussed above, neither O’Toole nor Holmes is believed to teach such a feature. Reconsideration and withdrawal are therefore

respectfully requested of the § 103(a) rejections of claim 11 and its dependent claims. Allowance of those claims also is requested.

Claims 15 and 16: Claim 15 is the independent one of these claims and is reproduced below as amended:

15. A device including a processor and memory, said memory having computer programs and data structures capable of being performed by said processor
to couple said device to an information server using a communication link;
to read a set of configuration information from a set of resources including at least a source local to said device and said information server;
to set values for one or more variables at said device in response to said configuration information, said configuration information being used at start-up by said device; and
if setting said values changes an indication of said set of resources, to re-perform reading said set of configuration information and setting of said values until said setting of said values does not change said indication of said set of resources;
wherein said setting of said values resolves conflicts when said configuration information from any two sources assigns two inconsistent values to any of said one or more variables by determining, for said any two sources, a higher priority said source and a lower priority said source.

This claim recites a device that substantially performs the method of claim 1. This claim recites the feature of, “if setting said values changes an indication of said set of resources, to re-perform reading said set of configuration information and setting of said values until said setting of said values does not change said indication of said set of resources.” Substantially as discussed above, neither O’Toole nor Holmes is believed to teach such a feature. Reconsideration and withdrawal are therefore respectfully requested of the § 103(a) rejections of claim 15 and its dependent claim 16. Allowance of those claims also is requested.

No Admission

Applicant's decision not to argue each of the dependent claims separately is not an admission that the subject matter of those claims is taught by the applied art.

Closing

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 205-3241. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Dated: February 7, 2006

Swernofsky Law Group PC
P.O. Box 390013
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013
(650) 947-0700